DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 218 CS 503 786

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE MPAA Film Ratings and Film Attendance: A Test of Reactance Theory.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Hartford, CT, May 8, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiences; *Evaluation Criteria; Film Industry; *Films; High School Students; *Media Research; Secondary Education; Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Response; *Motion Picture Ratings

ABSTRACT

Reactance theory predicts that when a behavioral freedom is restricted or eliminated an individual is motivationally aroused to restore that freedom. This theory served as the basis of a study that investigated whether motion picture ratings, specifically R and X ratings, acted as a source of reactance arousal for high school students. Subjects were 130 high school freshmen and seniors who were asked to indicate their likelihood of attending each of four different fictional films based on a film plot synopsis given to them on a single page. In addition to a plot summary, the page also provided information about the director, producer, screenwriter, and actors in the movie. Each also contained a notice of the film's rating. The experimental condition consisted of manipulating the rating over the four synopses. The students also completed self-report instruments and a questionnaire concerning their actual movie attendance patterns and eliciting demographic information. The results indicated only limited support for the reactance theory. Significant differences in likelihood of attendance were found for the sample as a whole and among students under 17 years of age. Data from the self-report measures and questionnaire showed that the subjects preferred movies with PG or R ratings. (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED214218

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# MPAA FILM RATINGS AND FILM ATTENDANCE: A TEST OF REACTANCE THEORY

BRUCE A. AUSTIN

Rochester Institute of Technology
College of General Studies
Rochester, New York 14623

"PERMISSION TO REPHODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Austin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented

to

The Eastern Communication Association
Annual Convention
Mass Communication
8 May 1982
Hartford, Connecticut

CS503786

MPAA FILM RATINGS AND FILM ATTENDANCE:

A TEST OF REACTANCE THEORY


SUMMARY

The study reported here investigates the influence of the movie rating system (G-PG-R-X) on film attendance. Brehm's theory of psychological reactance offered the theoretical basis for proposing that movie ratings might be influential in affecting movie attendance. Four methods for measuring attendance to movies by rating symbol were used: experimental (four by four simple Latin square), survey questionnaire, and two unobtrusive measures. Ss (n=130) in the study were high school students. Results indicated that reactance theory received limited support. The confluence of findings in this study shows the attractiveness of the two centrist rating categories, PG and R, which is explained in terms of the actual availability of movies in the marketplace by rating.

# MPAA FILM RATINGS AND FILM ATTENDANCE: A TEST OF REACTANCE THEORY

## A. INTRODUCTION

Practically since its adoption on November 1, 1968, numerous observers have ruminated about the influence of the Motion Picture Association of America's (MPAA) film rating system (G, PG, R, X) on movie attendance. Contrary to the system's avowed purpose, that of providing "advance information to enable parents to make judgments on the movies they want their children to see or not to see" (19, p.1), many such armchair philosophers have contended that certain ratings may either inhibit or attract audiences. This paper presents the results of an experiment which put to an empirical test a question that has long provoked speculation but scant scientific study: Do movie ratings influence attendance decisions?

Many observers of mass culture feel that movie ratings are interpreted by the public, regardless of age, as warnings concerning various aspects of film content. According to reactance theory such warnings or their classificatory implications may serve as motivational force leading to an increase in the attractiveness of certain films. Reactance theory predicts that when a behavioral freedom is restricted or eliminated the individual is motivationally aroused to restore

the threatened freedom. Moreover, the theory asserts that the more important, or salient, the behavioral freedom, the greater the reactance which is experienced. One method of freedom restoration is by actual attempts to engage in the endangered behavioral freedom (see 7, 8, 9). R and X ratings specifically restrict attendance among under 17-year-olds. Hence, such ratings may act as a source of reactance arousal for these individuals especially.

An application of the reactance theory approach, similar in theme to that offered by the present study, by Herman and Leyens (11) examined the audience for Belgian television (the RTB). The RTB broadcasts warnings (qualifications) about some of the movies it programs. Herman and Leyens recorded the viewing habits of a sample audience for RTB films broadcast over a four-year period and found that "qualifications make the movies more desirable for the television viewers. As a result, the movies with advisories were watched more than the movies without them" (p. 53).[1]

Despite the frequently voiced "cookie jar syndrome" espoused by some writers, the MPAA has always maintained that there exists no relationship whatsoever between a film's rating and its box office returns. However, as one report has noted, "there have been no researched studies on the relationship between the various MPAA ratings and box office receipts" (18, p. 54). Jack Valenti, MPAA president, has gone so far as to advance

"Valenti's Law of Ratings: If you have a movie that a lot of people want to see, no rating will hurt it. If you have a movie that few people want to see, no rating will help it" (21, pp. 2-3). Conversely, Fuchs and Lyle (10, p. 253) state that film ratings, especially those which prohibit attendance for certain age groups (R and X), "probably enhance a film's attractiveness."

But what is the state of the empirical body of knowledge concerning film ratings and their potential behavioral influence on audiences? Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, very few published reports exist on this topic. While research has been conducted on the public's awareness of the system (14, 20) and how they evaluate it (1, 13, 15, 24), the fairness with which ratings have been assigned to independent producers as compared to major studios (18), the distribution of top-grossing films by rating (3), and financial success ratios by rating (6), only six studies have even tangentially addressed the question of the ratings' influence on an individual's movie attendance.

A 1972 survey of Southern Californians conducted by the Los Angeles Times (12) reported that the rating of a movie as ranked by, respectively, adults and teenagers as the second and third most important variable (of a total of 15 variables presented) in determining whether or not to see a movie. Austin (4) reported that among high school students more than half indicated that a film's rating was either "very important" or "important" to their attendance decision. A study of the importance assigned by college students to 28 variables in the movie attendance

selection process (5) found that MPAA ratings ranked 19th in importance overall; occasional movie-goers (attendance of less than twice a month) also ranked this variable 19th while frequent (twice a month or more) movie-goers ranked it 15th in importance.

According to the Times study, 37% of the total sample would not go to see an X-rated film, 9% would not go to an R-rated movie, and 1% did not want to see G films; 8% preferred G- or PG-rated films while 5% preferred R or X. Respress' 1973 research (16) indicated that of the teenagers in his sample, 5% preferred G-rated films, 33% preferred GP (now PG), 47% preferred R, and 15% preferred X.

The Times study found that 49% of the adults and 60% of the teenagers in its sample reported that they checked to see what rating a movie had before deciding whether or not to attend. In agreement with this finding are the results of a study by Robertus and Simon (17) which found that teenagers were more likely than their parents to report using the ratings in film selection. (Note that this is somewhat at odds with the system's ostensible purpose -- that of providing advice for parents concerning their children's movie attendance.)

Only one (pilot) study, using an experimental design, has been conducted to directly test the influence of movie ratings on attendance (2). The results of that report showed no significant difference ($p > .05$) in the subjects' (high school students) likelihood of attending a film when the film's MPAA rating was varied. The present research is a replication of this

earlier study and offers two improvements: use of a larger sample and an expansion of the size of the response scale (from five to seven-points).

## B. METHOD

### 1. Subjects

This study employed a convenience sample. The respondents to the self-administered questionnaire and experimental instrument used in this study were members of three freshman- and three senior-level high school English classes. The high school is located in a middle-class, residential New York town. The data were collected on one day in May 1980.[2] A total of 130 questionnaires were collected, all of which were usable. Twenty-two Ss responded negatively to the experiment's manipulation check and were therefore eliminated from this analysis. For the sample as a whole (n=130), the 63 males and 62 females (5 Ss did not respond to this demographic item) ranged in age from 14 to 19 years; 51% were under 17 years of age.

### 2. Procedure

The experiment reported here replicates Austin's (2). Ss in the experiment were asked to indicate their likelihood of attending each of four different (fictitious) films. The experimental treatment consisted of presenting the Ss with four one-

page film plot synopses. Included in each synopsis were the film's title and an approximately 175-word description of the film. Following the synopsis (on the same page) was a short paragraph indicating the film's producer, director, screenplay writer, and male and female stars (all persons named here are actual film producers, directors, screenwriters, or actors). Finally, set off on a line of its own, the film's MPAA rating was noted (e.g., "This picture has been rated R: restricted, under 17-year-olds must be accompanied by a parent or guardian"). The experimental manipulation consisted of varying the MPAA film rating. Therefore, some Ss received film A as rated G, others received film A rated PG, and so forth. All Ss received a total of four film plot synopses: one with a G rating, one with a PG, one with an R, and one with an X. Thus, the experimental design employed here was a four (ratings) by four (film plot synopses) repeated measure simple Latin square. To control for the possibility of some Ss picking up a pattern (i.e., recognizing the experimental manipulation), the exact order of presentation of film synopses was systematically varied by MPAA rating. The Ss were randomly assigned to one of the four treatment groups.

The Ss were instructed to read each film plot synopsis and to then indicate their likelihood of attending each on a seven-point scale. Response options ranged from "Very likely to go to see this movie" to "Very unlikely to go to see this movie." The Ss were explicitly told not to compare one film

to any of the others when deciding on their likelihood of attendance. (Further, just before reaching the response options the Ss read the following: "For the film described above, ***title of film***, would you say that you are:") Following the four film plot synopses, on separate pages, the Ss were asked to indicate their sex, age, year in school, frequency of movie attendance, and the importance they assigned to movie-going as a leisure activity (measured on a seven-point scale).

The experimental instrument and questionnaire were completed by the Ss during their class period. The questionnaire included several inquiries relevant to the present study and not dealt with in the previous (2) study. These questionnaire items included the following: the respondents' familiarity with the rating system, whether they had attended R- and X-rated movies, and their general likelihood of attending movies with each of the four rating symbols (measured on a seven-point scale). In addition, two unobtrusive measures of movie attendance by rating were employed. First, the respondents were asked to indicate which of 121 movie titles presented them on a checklist they had attended. The titles represented all films advertised in the local daily newspaper during the three month period prior to administration of the questionnaire. Second, the respondents were asked to write the title of the last movie they had attended. All film titles were later assigned their MPAA

rating by consulting the MPAA's Classification and Rating Administration (CARA) Annual Reports.

For purposes of analysis the respondents were later placed into one of two attendance groups: persons reporting attendance of one movie a month or less were labeled as Occasional movie-goers (n=93); persons reporting attendance greater than one movie a month were labeled as Frequent movie-goers (n=37). The respondents were also later placed into one of two groups according to the importance they assigned movie-going as a leisure activity: persons reporting scale values of one through four on this measure were categorized in the Unimportant Activity group (n=86); persons reporting scale values of five through seven were categorized in the Important Activity group (n=44).

To determine the impact of movie ratings on attendance in the experimental condition the data were subjected to an analysis of variance test. Differences in the respondents' self-reporting of their general likelihood of attending movies with each of the four rating symbols were analyzed by sex, age, and importance of movie-going using ANOVA. Pearson product-moment correlation was also employed to measure the association between respondents' likelihood of attendance at films with each of the four ratings. The justification for using inferential statistics with a non-probability sample may be found in Winch and Campbell (22).[3]

## C. RESULTS

To assert that movie ratings act as a reactance arousal stimulus implies that individuals are aware of the rating system and its meaning with regard to freedom restrictions. Virtually all (98.4%) of the respondents in this study, when asked about their familiarity with the rating system, reported that they were. No significant differences ($p > .05$) were found when the respondents were crosstabulated by age or sex.

Results of the ANOVA routine performed on the experimental data are reported in Table 1. The two following results pertain to the experimental instrument itself. A significant

---

Table 1 About Here

---

interaction effect ($p=.029$) was found for Importance x Film x Age. Under 17-year-old Ss who evaluated movie-going as an Important leisure activity preferred one plot synopsis more than all other groups of Ss regardless of the synopsis' rating. A significant main effect ($p=.029$) was found for the film plot synopses themselves indicating that the Ss responded to the synopses differently regardless of rating. These findings contradict those of the pilot study (2) which found the four synopses in the experimental instrument to be perceived as neutral. Thus, caution must be used when interpreting the final significant finding.

The pilot study for this experiment (2) reported no significant difference ($p > .05$) in likelihood of attendance by MPAA rating. The present study, however, found a highly significant ($p < .001$) main effect for the rating variable. Analysis of these data indicates that overall the sample significantly preferred PG- and R-rated films to X-rated films. Ss under 17 years significantly preferred G-, PG-, and R-rated films to films with an X rating. There were no significant differences among Ss 17 years and older for likelihood of attendance by MPAA rating. The rank order by mean likelihood of attendance scores, from most to least likely, was PG - R - G - X for the sample as a whole and for Ss 17 years and older; among Ss under 17 years the rank order was R - PG - G - X. The Rating x Age, Importance x Rating, and Importance x Rating x Age interactions all proved to be nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

Turning now to the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to indicate their likelihood of attending films with each of the four rating symbols. Table 2 presents the results of the three-way ANOVA performed for each of the four ratings.

---

Table 2 About Here

---

No significant differences were found for G-rated films. For films with a PG rating the following significant differences

were found: under 17-year-olds were more likely than 17s and older to attend; persons evaluating movie-going as important were more likely to attend than those evaluating movie-going as unimportant; females were more likely to attend than males; and under 17-year-old females who evaluated movie-going as important were significantly more likely to attend than any other sample subgroup combination. For films with an R rating two significant main effects were found: 17s and older were more likely to attend than were under 17-year-olds and persons evaluating movie-going as important were more likely to attend than were persons who evaluated movie-going as unimportant. Finally, for X-rated movies one significant main effect was found: males were more likely to attend than females. The rank order by mean likelihood of attendance scores for the sample as a whole, from most to least likely, was R-PG-G-X.

T-test comparisons between mean likelihood of attendance scores for each of the four symbols for the sample as a whole showed the following results: no significant difference between G and X ($t=.859$, $df=249$); PG was significantly preferred over both G ($t=10.436$, $df=250$, $p<.001$, two-tailed) and X ($t=9.947$, $df=249$, $p<.001$, two-tailed); R was significantly preferred over G ($t=12.25$, $df=250$, $p<.001$, two-tailed), PG ($t=2.147$, $df=250$, $p<.05$, two-tailed), and X ($t=11.528$, $df=249$, $p<.001$, two-tailed).

Results of the Pearson product-moment correlations

computed for general likelihood of attendance to the four symbols are presented in Table 3. Most of the significant positive relationships were found between G- and PG-rated

---

Table 3 About Here

---

films and between PG- and R-rated films. R and X ratings were found to correlate positively with each other, albeit in most instances only modestly.

The respondents were asked a series of questions inquiring as to their actual previous attendance at R- and X-rated films. Virtually all of the respondents (90.5%) reported having attended an R-rated film; persons 17 and older were significantly more likely to have attended such films than under 17-year-olds ($X^2$=6.85, df=1, p=.008, C=.251). Only 29.9% of the sample reported ever having attended an X-rated movie; persons 17 and older were significantly more likely to have attended X-rated movies than under 17-year-olds ($X^2$=7.26, df=1, p=.007, C=.248).

Results of the respondents actual attendance at the 121 films presented them on the checklist indicate that PG- and R-rated movies accounted for 75.4% of the sample's movie attendance. No significant difference in attendance by rating was found between respondents under 17 years and those 17 years and older ($X^2$=4.18, df=3, p$>$.05). Among under 17-year-olds 80.6% of the movies attended by them, as presented on the checklist, were PG- or R-rated; among the 17 years and older group the comparable

figure was 70.8%. The rank order of attendance by rating, from most to least frequently attended, was R-PG-G-X.

A total of 55 titles was reported by the respondents as the film most recently attended. As was found in the checklist situation, PG- and R-rated movies predominated, accounting for 89.9% of the respondents' most recent attendance. No significant difference in attendance by rating was found between the two age groups ($X^2=2.26$, df=3, $p > .05$). Among the younger group, 91.4% of the movies they had most recently attended were rated either PG or R; the older group's attendance to PG and R movies was only slightly lower, 88.2%. The rank order of attendance by rating, from most to least frequently attended, was R-PG-G-X.

## D. DISCUSSION

Based on the results of this study it may be concluded that reactance theory received limited support. In the experimental condition significant differences in likelihood of attendance were found for the sample as a whole and among Ss under 17 years; however, higher order interactions proved to be nonsignificant. The data gathered by self-report general likelihood of attendance and the two unobtrusive measures of actual attendance by rating symbol all point to a clear preference for pictures with a PG or R rating. In both the experimental and self-report conditions the G and X ratings were clearly the least preferred.

Reactance theory suggests that the more important the threatened behavioral freedom, the greater the reactance that

is aroused and hence the stronger the desire to regain the freedom. Analysis of the data in both the experimental and self-report conditions does not support this hypothesis: importance of movie-going as a leisure activity was an uninfluential variable. However, these findings may be more a result of the method used to measure the variable than a failure to support the theoretical underpinnings. Future research should be directed at developing a more sensitive instrument for ascertaining salience of movie-going before discounting this variable as inoperative.

Reactance theory also suggests a linear relationship between the intensity of freedom restriction (i.e., threat or elimination) and subsequent attempts at freedom restoration. Thus, theoretically, the X rating should evoke stronger reactance arousal than the R rating. Again, the data reported here do not support such an assertion. However, reactance theory also maintains that direct attempts at freedom restoration "can be expected to occur only to the extent that there is a realistic possiblity of succeeding" (7, p. 10). Thus, it is plausible to suggest that underage persons recognize -- or perceive there to be -- the stricter enforcement of age restrictions for X-rated than R-rated films and hence do not engage in direct attempts at freedom restoration.

Finally, the confluence of findings in this study, using a number and variety of methods, points to the attractiveness of the two centrist rating categories, PG and R. This observation

can be explained in terms of the actual availability of movies in the marketplace by rating. Since the rating system's adoption in 1968, PG and R have been the most frequently assigned symbols (see 3) accounting for more than three-quarters of all films rated. CARA's 1980 Annual Report, for instance, indicates that a total of 330 feature-length movies were rated during 1980: 5% were assigned the G rating, 39% a PG, 47% a R, and 9% a X. Therefore, one's opportunity to attend G- and X-rated pictures, perhaps regardless of desire, was very limited. Simply put, there are more PG and R films in circulation and available for viewing than there are G and X films. From this one may conclude that the menu equals the diet; that which is most frequently offered is that which is most frequently consumed.

The present study offers several avenues for future research. First, replication of the experiment is called for; whereas the pilot study (2) reported the experimental instrument as being perceived neutrally, the study reported here found significant differences between likelihood of attending the four film plot synopses irrespective of MPAA rating. Second, as has been suggested above, development of a more sensitive scale for measuring the importance of the behavioral freedom is needed before discarding this variable as uninfluential. Last, development of a valid and reliable scale to measure attitudes toward age restrictions on movie attendance might provide increased use for reactance theory. It can be suggested that attitudinal inclination toward the concept of freedom restriction or elimination

might act as an antecedent variable effecting subsequent reactance arousal and behavior.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Latin Square

| Source | SS | df | ms | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 1159.91 | 425 | | | |
| Between subjects | 386.91 | 107 | 3.62 | | |
| Importance (I) | 9.87 | 1 | 9.87 | 2.67 | >.05 |
| Age (A) | .12 | 1 | .12 | .03 | >.05 |
| Group (G)* | 8.26 | 3 | 2.75 | .75 | >.05 |
| I x A | 2.83 | 1 | 2.83 | .77 | >.05 |
| I x G | 4.86 | 3 | 1.62 | .44 | >.05 |
| A x G | 17.06 | 3 | 5.69 | 1.54 | >.05 |
| I x A x G | 4.30 | 3 | 1.43 | .39 | >.05 |
| Error | 339.60 | 92 | 3.69 | | |
| Within subjects | 773.00 | 318 | | | |
| Rating (R) | 43.42 | 3 | 14.47 | 6.91 | .001 |
| Film (F) | 19.07 | 3 | 6.36 | 3.04 | .029 |
| R x F | 15.70 | 6 | 2.62 | 1.25 | .281 |
| I x R | 7.12 | 3 | 2.37 | 1.13 | .336 |
| I x F | 6.87 | 3 | 2.29 | 1.09 | .353 |
| I x R x F | 23.47 | 6 | 3.91 | 1.87 | .087 |
| R x A | 14.45 | 3 | 4.82 | 2.30 | .076 |
| F x A | 8.10 | 3 | 2.70 | 1.29 | .278 |
| R x F x A | 16.90 | 6 | 2.82 | 1.35 | .237 |
| I x R x A | 7.16 | 3 | 2.39 | 1.14 | .334 |
| I x F x A | 19.09 | 3 | 6.36 | 3.04 | .029 |
| I x R x F x A | 26.14 | 6 | 4.36 | 2.08 | .056 |
| Error | 565.51 | 270 | 2.09 | | |

*Rating x Film

TABLE 2

ANOVA: Likelihood of Attending G, PG, R, and X Movies by Age, Sex, and Importance of Movie-Going

G-rated Movies

| Source | SS | df | ms | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 285.790 | 119 | 2.401 | | |
| Age (A) | .291 | 1 | .291 | .127 | .722 |
| Importance (I) | 3.119 | 1 | 3.119 | 1.360 | .245 |
| Sex (S) | 5.153 | 1 | 5.153 | 2.248 | .136 |
| A x I | .872 | 1 | .872 | .380 | .538 |
| A x S | 2.298 | 1 | 2.298 | 1.003 | .318 |
| I x S | 2.165 | 1 | 2.165 | .944 | .333 |
| A x I x S | 8.515 | 1 | 8.515 | 3.714 | .056 |
| Error | 256.778 | 112 | 2.292 | | |

PG-rated Movies

| Source | SS | df | ms | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 216.800 | 119 | 1.821 | | |
| A | 7.636 | 1 | 7.636 | 5.433 | .021 |
| I | 6.415 | 1 | 6.415 | 4.564 | .034 |
| S | 21.810 | 1 | 21.810 | 15.515 | .000 |
| A x I | 4.796 | 1 | 4.796 | 3.412 | .067 |
| A x S | 4.714 | 1 | 4.714 | 3.354 | .069 |
| I x S | .080 | 1 | .080 | .057 | .811 |
| A x I x S | 12.316 | 1 | 12.316 | 8.761 | .003 |
| Error | 157.440 | 112 | 1.405 | | |

R-rated Movies

| Source | SS | df | ms | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 235.466 | 119 | 1.998 | | |
| A | 11.505 | 1 | 11.505 | 6.505 | .012 |
| I | 7.532 | 1 | 7.532 | 4.258 | .041 |
| S | 3.761 | 1 | 3.761 | 2.126 | .147 |
| A x I | 2.272 | 1 | 2.272 | 1.258 | .259 |
| A x S | 2.965 | 1 | 2.965 | 1.676 | .198 |
| I x S | .973 | 1 | .973 | .055 | .814 |
| A x I x S | .000 | 1 | .000 | .000 | .984 |
| Error | 198.101 | 112 | 1.768 | | |

X-rated Movies

| Source | SS | df | ms | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 452.000 | 119 | 3.798 | | |
| A | 1.779 | 1 | 1.779 | .528 | .468 |
| I | 6.494 | 1 | 6.494 | 1.928 | .167 |
| S | 48.124 | 1 | 48.124 | 14.284 | .000 |
| A x I | 3.668 | 1 | 3.668 | 1.089 | .298 |
| A x S | 6.117 | 1 | 6.117 | 1.816 | .180 |
| I x S | .538 | 1 | .538 | .160 | .690 |
| A x I x S | 1.992 | 1 | 1.992 | .295 | .588 |
| Error | 377.353 | 112 | 3.369 | | |

TABLE 3

Pearson Correlation: Likelihood of Attending Films Relative to MPAA Rating

| | PG | R | X |
|---|---|---|---|
| G | | | |
| Total sample (n=130) | .50*** | .05 | -.14 |
| Under 17s - Unimportant (n=44) | .56*** | .17 | -.12 |
| Under 17s - Important (n=23) | .46* | -.29 | -.11 |
| Under 17s (n=67) | .53*** | -.02 | -.08 |
| 17 & Above - Unimportant (n=42) | .32* | -.18 | -.34* |
| 17 & Above - Important (n=21) | .60** | .51* | -.15 |
| 17 & Above (n=63) | .46*** | .17 | -.26* |
| PG | | | |
| Total | | .43*** | -.11 |
| Under 17s - Unimportant | | .43** | -.19 |
| Under 17s - Important | | .28 | -.01 |
| Under 17s | | .38*** | -.06 |
| 17 & Above - Unimportant | | .43** | -.17 |
| 17 & Above - Important | | .68*** | -.17 |
| 17 & Above | | .58*** | -.18 |
| R | | | |
| Total | | | .30*** |
| Under 17s - Unimportant | | | .31* |
| Under 17s - Important | | | .50* |
| Under 17s | | | .39*** |
| 17 & Above - Unimportant | | | .07 |
| 17 & Above - Important | | | .21 |
| 17 & Above | | | .08 |

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed)
** $p < .01$ (two-tailed)
*** $p < .001$ (two-tailed)

## FOOTNOTES

[1]For a related study on advisory warnings broadcast on U.S. television see 23.

[2]Copies of both the questionnaire and experimental instrument are available from the author.

[3]A test-retest reliability check resulted in an overall r (Pearson product-moment correlation) of +.73 for the film plot synopses and +.61 for six survey items. Additional information and data concerning reliability is available from the author.

REFERENCES


1. Aaronson, C. S. Majority of students approve film ratings. Boxoffice, June 18, 1973, p. 7.
2. Austin, B. A. The influence of the MPAA's film-rating system on motion picture attendance: A pilot study. Journal of Psychology, 1980, 106, 91-99.
3. Austin, B. A. Rating the movies. Journal of Popular Film and Television, 1980, 7, 384-399.
4. Austin, B. A. Motion picture attendance and factors influencing movie selection among high school students. ERIC Document, No. ED 177 630. Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia, 22210.
5. Austin, B. A. Film attendance: Why college students chose to see their most recent film. Journal of Popular Film and Television, in press.
6. Austin, B. A., Nicolich, M. J., and Simonet, T. Movie ratings and revenues: Eleven years of success ratios. ERIC Document, No. ED 191 102. Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia, 22210.
7. Brehm, J. W. A theory of psychological reactance. New York: Academic Press, 1966.
8. Brehm, J. W. Responses to loss of freedom: A theory of psychological reactance. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1972.
9. Clee, M. A. and Wicklund, R. A. Consumer behavior and

psychological reactance. Journal of Consumer Research, 1980, 6, 389-405.

10. Fuchs, D. A. and Lyle, J. Mass media portrayal -- Sex and violence. In F. G. Kline and P. J. Tichenor (Eds.), Current perspectives in mass communication research. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972.

11. Herman, G. and Leyens, J. P. Rating films on TV. Journal of Communication, 1977, 27, 48-53.

12. Los Angeles Times. A look at southern California movie-going. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Times, Marketing Research Department, 1972.

13. O'Dell, S. L. A study of parents' attitudes toward the Motion Picture Association of America rating system. Unpublished M. A. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.

14. Opinion Research Corporation. An appraisal of the motion picture industry's voluntary rating system. Princeton, New Jersey: Opinion Research Corporation, July-August 1977.

15. Poll okay for MPAA ratings. Variety, October 22, 1980, p. 5.

16. Respress, J. R. The new motion picture code and its effects on teenage audiences. Unpublished M. A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1973.

17. Robertus, P. and Simon , R. J. The movie code: A view from parents and teenagers. Journalism Quarterly, 1970, 47, 568-569, 629.

18. Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems. Movie ratings and the independent producer. H.R., 95th Congress, 2d session, report no. 95-996. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, March 1978.

19. Valenti, J. The movie rating system. New York: Motion Picture Association of America, n.d., mimeographed.

20. Valenti, J. Rating the movies. Journal of Communication, 1976, 26, 62-63.

21. Valenti, J. Remarks to the annual convention of the National Association of Theater Owners. Miami Beach, Florida, October 26, 1977.

22. Winch, R. F. and Campbell, D. T. Proof? No. Evidence? Yes. The significance of tests of significance. American Sociologist, 1969, 4, 140-143.

23. Wurtzel A. and Surlin, S. Viewer attitudes toward television advisory warnings. Journal of Broadcasting, 1978, 22, 19-31.

24. Yeager, S. W. G-GP-R-X: A Q-study of the movie industry's latest attempt at self-regulation. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Missouri, 1971.